

**RECEIVED**  
**CENTRAL FAX CENTER**  
**AUG 27 2007**

**Remarks:**

These remarks are responsive to the Office action dated June 26, 2007. Prior to entry of this response, claims 1-19 and 21-37 were pending in the application. By way of this response, claims 1, 7, 14 and 25 are amended. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the application and allowance of the pending claims.

**Allowable Subject Matter**

Claims 13 and 37 are not rejected over the prior art of record. Applicant thanks the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter and elects to await disposition of other pending claims in this response before taking action with respect to claims 13 and 37.

**Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Claims 1-19 and 21-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Applicant traverses this rejection and specifically refers to paragraph 37, in particular the first sentence, "Each piece of personal or other confidential data entered on a token can carry a credibility weight based upon the various credibility coefficients attached to it." To clarify this support, Applicant amends claims 1, 14, and 25 to recite that each piece of *personal or other confidential* data entered on a *storage device* can carry a credibility weight based upon the various credibility coefficients attached to it.

**Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 1-2, 9-10, 14-19, 25-26, and 33-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 7,111,173 (Scheidt) in view of U.S. Patent Number 7,085,925 (Hanna).

Claims 3-8, 11-12, 21-24, 27-32, and 35-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Scheidt in view of Hanna and U.S. Patent Number 6,948,066 (Hind).

Page 13 of 15

Application Number 10/623,337  
Response Date: August 27, 2007  
Reply to Office Action of June 26, 2007

Claim 1 as amended recites in part, assigning a credibility coefficient to *data* in the data record based on an evaluation of the credibility record, wherein each piece of personal or confidential data entered in the data storage device is associated with a credibility weight based upon credibility coefficients assigned to the data record. Support for this amended limitation can be found in the detailed description and summary and in particular in paragraph 37. Applicant agrees with the assertion in the Office action that Scheidt does not disclose assigning a credibility coefficient to the credentials in the data record. Applicant further asserts that Scheidt does not disclose assigning a credibility coefficient to data in the data record, separate from credentials used to access the data record. Hanna was offered to teach this limitation.

Applicants have reviewed the Hanna reference and found no teaching or suggestion to apply credibility weights to the data within the data record, as opposed to applying credibility weights to the credentials used to access the data record in the first place. In distinction, Hanna discusses assigning a credibility coefficient to access *credentials* (see Abstract; and col. 8, lines 32-60). In this manner Hanna uses credibility coefficients to determine data record access privileges. In contrast, Applicant's claim recites applying credibility coefficients to the data within the data record itself. Credibility coefficients and weights attached to the data itself allows a user who has already been determined to have sufficient data record access rights the ability to evaluate the credibility of the data within the record the user has access to. Further, Applicant has reviewed the Hind reference and could find no teaching or suggestion to cure the deficiencies of Scheidt in view of Hanna, for any of the pending claims.

Applicant respectfully asserts that this is different than using credibility coefficients to gain access to data in the first instance, and therefore submit claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over the cited references. Claims 14 and 25 contain similar limitations using credibility coefficients on the data itself, and are therefore patentably distinguishable over the cited references for at least the same reasons as claim 1. All claims depending from claims 1, 14 and 25

**RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER****AUG 27 2007**

necessarily contain these same limitations, and are patentably distinguishable over the cited references for at least these same reasons.

Conclusion

Applicant believes that this application is now in condition for allowance, in view of the above amendments and remarks. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner issue a Notice of Allowability covering the pending claims. If the Examiner has any questions, or if a telephone interview would in any way advance prosecution of the application, please contact the undersigned attorney of record.

Please charge any cost incurred in the filing of this Response, along with any other costs, to Deposit Account No. 503397.

Respectfully submitted,

ALLEMAN HALL MCCOY RUSSELL & TUTTLE LLP



Brian G Forrest  
Registration No. 58,584  
Customer No. 50488  
Attorney/Agent for Applicant/Assignee  
806 S.W. Broadway, Suite 600  
Portland, Oregon 97205  
Telephone: (503) 459-4141  
Facsimile: (503) 459-4142

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning  
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

**BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES**

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☐ **BLACK BORDERS**
- ☐ **IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**
- ☐ **FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES**
- ☐ **COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**
- ☐ **GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**
- ☒ **LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**
- ☐ **REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**
- ☐ **OTHER:** \_\_\_\_\_

**IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.**

**As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.**